

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 19-1051V

(not to be published)

BARBARA TURNER, as Personal
Representative of the ESTATE OF
HARRY TURNER,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: March 16, 2022

Special Processing Unit (SPU);
Attorney's Fees and Costs

*Leah VaSahnja Durant, Law Offices of Leah V. Durant, PLLC, Washington, DC, for
Petitioner.*

Mark Kim Hellie, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

DECISION ON ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS¹

On July 22, 2019, Barbara Turner, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Harry Turner, filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² (the "Vaccine Act"). Petitioner alleged that Mr. Turner suffered Guillain Barré syndrome as a result of an influenza vaccination administered to him on October 11, 2017. (Petition at 1). On July 27, 2021, a

¹ Because this unpublished Decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Decision will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

decision was issued awarding compensation to Petitioner in the amount of \$150,000.00. (ECF No. 40).

Petitioner has now filed a motion for attorney's fees and costs, dated February 1, 2022 (ECF No. 45), requesting an award of \$53,427.64 (representing \$50,517.90 in fees and \$2,909.74 in costs). In accordance with General Order No. 9, Petitioner filed a signed statement indicating that she incurred out-of-pocket expenses in the amount of \$1,465.40. (Id. at 2). Respondent reacted to the motion on February 14, 2022, indicating that he is satisfied that the statutory requirements for an award of attorney's fees and costs are met in this case, but deferring resolution of the amount to be awarded at the Court's discretion. (ECF No.46). On February 15, 2022, Petitioner filed a reply requesting the fees and costs be awarded in full. (ECF No. 47).

I have reviewed the billing records submitted with Petitioner's request. In my experience, the request appears reasonable, and I find no cause to reduce the requested hours or rates.

The Vaccine Act permits an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs. Section 15(e). **Accordingly, Petitioner is awarded the total amount of \$54,893.04³ as follows:**

- **A lump sum of \$53,427.64, representing reimbursement for attorneys' fees and costs, in the form of a check payable jointly to Petitioner and Petitioner's counsel; and**
- **A lump sum of \$1,465.40, representing reimbursement for Petitioner's costs, in the form of a check payable to Petitioner.**

In the absence of a timely-filed motion for review (see Appendix B to the Rules of the Court), the Clerk shall enter judgment in accordance with this decision.⁴

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran
Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master

³ This amount is intended to cover all legal expenses incurred in this matter. This award encompasses all charges by the attorney against a client, "advanced costs" as well as fees for legal services rendered. Furthermore, § 15(e)(3) prevents an attorney from charging or collecting fees (including costs) that would be in addition to the amount awarded herein. See *generally Beck v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 924 F.2d 1029 (Fed. Cir.1991).

⁴ Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), the parties may expedite entry of judgment by filing a joint notice renouncing their right to seek review.